

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/712,988	11/12/2003	Ljupco Kocarev	2110-85-3	7343	
GRAYBEAL	7590 02/18/2009 IACKSON HALEY LLP	EXAM	EXAMINER		
Suite. 350			NGO, CHUONG D		
155-108th Av Bellevue, WA		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			2193		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/18/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/712,988	KOCAREV ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Chuong D. Ngo	2193		

		1					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
 Al The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A 			ata a la tata a da				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire! Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(n).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checket, Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF AFFEAT. 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause				
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1							
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13 		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e.	xplanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: <u>11 and 12</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10 and 13-27</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). ______

/Chuong D Ngo/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2193 Continuation of 3. NOTE: the recitation "an encrypter coupled to the memory and operable to encrypt data with the first chaos-based pseudo-random value", for example, as now recited in claims 26 and 27 raise new issues the would require further consideration and/or search. Further, there is a period, "in claim 1, line 17, and claim 8 appears redundant by the proposed amendment to claim 1.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive since the proposed amendment will not be entered. Further, both Butler and Smeets clearly disclose the random numbers are to be used in Crybtographic applications, and the generations of a chaos-based pseudor-andom sequence as disclosed in these references do not involve any truly random source but merely based on arithmetic and logic operations. Thus, the generated sequence is not really true random since it can be repeated by using the same arithmetic and logic operations. Therefore, the generated sequences in Butler and Smeets are clearly a chaos-based pseudo-sequence as claimed. All the rejections stand for the same reasons set forth in the final reflection.